Case 1:07-cv-10833-AKH Documen	t 1 Filed 11/08/2007 Page 1 of 11
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK	
IN RE WORLD TRADE CENTER DISASTER SITE LITIGATION	21 MC 100 (AKH)  DOCKET NO.
ROLAND ROBERTS AND AMELIA ROBERTS  Plaintiffs,  - against -  A RUSSO WRECKING, ET. AL.,	CHECK-OFF ("SHORT FORM") COMPLAINT RELATED TO THE MASTER COMPLAINT PLAINTIFF(S) DEMAND A TRIAL BY JURY
SEE ATTACHED RIDER,	
2006, ("the Order"), Amended Master Complaints for	erstein, United States District Judge, dated June 22, or all Plaintiffs were filed on August 18, 2006.
instant Phintiff(s) as if fully set forth herein in ad	Complaint are applicable to and are adopted by the dition to those paragraphs specific to the individual ed with an '\overline{\sigma}'' if applicable to the instant Plaintiff(s), below.
Plaintiffs, ROLAND ROBERTS AND AME	LIA ROBERTS, by his/her/their attorneys WORBY

Υ GRONER EDELMAN & NAPOLI BERN, LLP, complaining of Defendant(s), respectfully allege:

# I. PARTIES

### A. PLAINTIFF(S)

1.	✓ Plaintiff, ROLAND	ROBERTS (hereinafter the	e "Injured Plaintiff"), is an individual
and a citizen	of New York residing at 20	Paladino Avenue, Apt. 1	1H, New York, NY 10035
		(OR)	
2.	Alternatively, $\square$	is the	of Decedent
	, and brings this claim	n in his (her) capacity as	of the Estate of

"Derivative Plaintiff'), is a citizen of New NY 10035-, and has the following is and has been lawfully married to Plaintiff s derivative action for her (his) loss due to the wife), Plaintiff ROLAND ROBERTS.  The Injured Plaintiff worked for NYC  The following dates and locations  The Barge  The one and the property of the power per days for the power per days for the new NYC that the power per days for the power per days for the new NYC that the power per days for the new NYC that the power per days for the new NYC that the power per days for the new NYC that the power per days for the new NYC that the power per days for the new NYC that the power per days for the new NYC that the new NYC that the power per days for the new NYC that the power per days for the new NYC that the power per days for the new NYC that the power per days for the new NYC that the power per days for the new NYC that the power per days for the new NYC that the power per days for the new NYC that the power per days for the new NYC that the power per days for the new NYC that the power per days for the new NYC that the power per days for the new NYC that the power per days for the new NYC that the new NYC that the power per days for the new NYC that the power per days for the new NYC that t
the following dates and locations  The Barge  on or about until;
on or about;
boximately hours per day; for coximately days total.  ther:* For injured plaintiffs who worked at
WTC Site building or location. The injured iff worked at the address/location, for the alleged, for the hours per day, for the total and for the employer, as specified below:
on or about until; eximately hours per day; for eximately days total; e and Address of Non-WTC Site ing/Worksite:
necessary. If more space is needed to specify et of paper with the information.
fumes on all dates, at the site(s) indicated ed toxic substances and particulates on all ned toxic or caustic substances on all dates at
no en

6.

		l Plaintiff
[	<b>√</b> Ĭ	Has not made a claim to the Victim Compensation Fund. Pursuant to \$405(c)(3)(B)(i) of the Air Transportation Safety and System Stabilization Act, 49 U.S.C. § 40101, the issue of waiver is inapplicable.
		Made a claim to the Victim Compensation Fund that was denied. Pursuant to $\$405(c)(3)(B)(i)$ of the Air Transportation Safety and System Stabilization Act, 49 U.S.C. $\$40101$ , the issue of waiver is inapplicable.
		Made a claim to the Victim Compensation Fund, that was subsequently withdrawn by Ground-Zero Plaintiff. Pursuant to § 405(c)(3)(B)(i) of the Air Transportation Safety and System Stabilization Act, 49 U.S.C. § 40101, the issue of waiver is inapplicable.
		Made a claim to the Victim Compensation Fund that was granted. Pursuant to $\$405(c)(3)(B)(i)$ of the Air Transportation Safety and System Stabilization Act, 49 U.S.C. $\$40101$ , Ground Zero-Plaintiff has waived her/his right(s) to pursue any further legal action for the injuries identified in said claim.

#### B. DEFENDANT(S)

The following is a list of all Defendant(s) named in the Master Complaint. If checked, all paragraphs pertaining to that Defendant are deemed pleaded herein.

☐ THE CITY OF NEW YORK	☑ A RUSSO WRECKING
☐ A Notice of Claim was timely filed and	☑ ABM INDUSTRIES, INC.
served on and	$\square$ ABM JANITORIAL NORTHEAST, INC.
	☑ AMEC CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT,
☐ pursuant to General Municipal Law §50-	INC.
h the CITY held a hearing on(OR)	☑ AMEC EARTH & ENVIRONMENTAL, INC.
☐ The City has yet to hold a hearing as	☑ ANTHONY CORTESE SPECIALIZED
required by General Municipal Law §50-h	HAULING, LLC, INC.
$\square$ More than thirty days have passed and	☑ ATLANTIC HEYDT CORP
the City has not adjusted the claim	☑ BECHTEL ASSOCIATES PROFESSIONAL
(OR)	CORPORATION
☐ An Order to Show Cause application to	☑ BECHTEL CONSTRUCTION, INC.
deem Plaintiff's (Plaintiffs') Notice of	☑ BECHTEL CORPORATION
Claim timely filed, or in the alternative to grant	☑ BECHTEL ENVIRONMENTAL, INC.
Plaintiff(s) leave to file a late Notice of Claim	☑ BERKEL & COMPANY, CONTRACTORS,
Nunc Pro Tunc (for leave to file a late Notice of	INC.
Claim <i>Nunc Pro Tunc</i> ) has been filed and a	☑ BIG APPLE WRECKING & CONSTRUCTION
determination	CORP
☐ is pending	☐ BOVIS LEND LEASE, INC.
☐ Granting petition was made on	☑ BOVIS LEND LEASE LMB, INC.
☐ Denying petition was made on	☑ BREEZE CARTING CORP
=======================================	☑ BREEZE NATIONAL, INC.
☐ PORT AUTHORITY OF NEW YORK AND	$\square$ BRER-FOUR TRANSPORTATION CORP.
NEW JERSEY ["PORT AUTHORITY"]	☑ BURO HAPPOLD CONSULTING ENGINEERS,
☐ A Notice of Claim was filed and served	P.C.
pursuant to Chapter 179, §7 of The	☑ C.B. CONTRACTING CORP
Unconsolidated Laws of the State of New	☑ CANRON CONSTRUCTION CORP
York on	☐ CONSOLIDATED EDISON COMPANY OF
☐ More than sixty days have elapsed since	NEW YORK, INC.
the Notice of Claim was filed, (and)	☑ CORD CONTRACTING CO., INC
☐ the PORT AUTHORITY has	☐ CRAIG TEST BORING COMPANY INC.
adjusted this claim	<ul><li>✓ DAKOTA DEMO-TECH</li><li>✓ DIAMOND POINT EXCAVATING CORP</li></ul>
☐ the PORT AUTHORITY has not	
adjusted this claim.	☑ DIEGO CONSTRUCTION, INC. ☑ DIVERSIFIED CARTING, INC.
	☑ DIVERSIFIED CARTING, INC. ☑ DMT ENTERPRISE, INC.
□ 1 WORLD TRADE CENTER, LLC	☑ DMT ENTERFRISE, INC. ☑ D'ONOFRIO GENERAL CONTRACTORS
□ 1 WTC HOLDINGS, LLC	CORP
☐ 2 WORLD TRADE CENTER, LLC	☑ EAGLE LEASING & INDUSTRIAL SUPPLY
□ 2 WTC HOLDINGS, LLC	✓ EAGLE ONE ROOFING CONTRACTORS INC.
□ 4 WORLD TRADE CENTER, LLC	□ EAGLE SCAFFOLDING CO, INC.
□ 4 WTC HOLDINGS, LLC	☑ EJ DAVIES, INC.
☐ 5 WORLD TRADE CENTER, LLC	☑ EN-TECH CORP
☐ 5 WTC HOLDINGS, LLC	□ ET ENVIRONMENTAL
☐ 7 WORLD TRADE COMPANY, L.P.	□EVANS ENVIRONMENTAL

Please read this document carefully.

It is very important that you fill out each and every section of this document.

☑ ROYAL GM INC.

☑ SAB TRUCKING INC.

✓ SAFEWAY ENVIRONMENTAL CORP

☑ SEASONS INDUSTRIAL CONTRACTING

☑ ZIEGENFUSS DRILLING, INC. ☐ OTHER:

✓ YORK HUNTER CONSTRUCTION, LLC

✓ YONKERS CONTRACTING COMPANY, INC.

☑ YANNUZZI & SONS INC

Please read this document carefully.

It is very important that you fill out each and every section of this document.

## 

☐ Non-WTC Site Building Owner	☐ Non-WTC Site Building Managing Agent
Name:	Name:
Business/Service Address:	
Building/Worksite Address:	Building/Worksite Address:
☐ Non-WTC Site Lessee	· ·
Name:	
Business/Service Address:	
Building/Worksite Address:	

# Case 1:07-cv-10833-AKH Document 1 Filed 11/08/2007 Page 7 of 11 II. JURISDICTION

The Court's jurisdiction over the subject matter of this action is:

	ounded upon Federal Question Jurisdiction; spe lization Act of 2001, (or); ☐ Federal Officers I ; ☐ Contested, b	Jurisdi		
remo	val jurisdiction over this action, pursuant to 28			
	III CAUSE	S OF	ACTION	
of lial	Plaintiff(s) seeks damages against the above named defendants based upon the following theories of liability, and asserts each element necessary to establish such a claim under the applicable substantive law:			
<b>V</b>	Breach of the defendants' duties and obligations pursuant to the New York State Labor Law(s) including §§ 200 and 240	<b>V</b>	Common Law Negligence, including allegations of Fraud and Misrepresentation	
<b>V</b>	Breach of the defendants' duties and obligations pursuant to the New York State Labor Law 241(6)		<ul> <li>✓ Air Quality;</li> <li>✓ Effectiveness of Mask Provided;</li> <li>☐ Effectiveness of Other Safety Equipment Provided</li> </ul>	
	Pursuant to New York General Municipal Law §205-a		(specify:);  ☑ Other(specify): Not yet determined	
	Pursuant to New York General Municipal Law §205-e		Wrongful Death	
		<b>V</b>	Loss of Services/Loss of Consortium for Derivative Plaintiff	
		П	Other:	

#### Case 1:07-cv-10833-AKH Document 1 Filed 11/08/2007 Page 8 of 11 IV CAUSATION, INJURY AND DAMAGE

1. As a direct and proximate result of defendant's culpable actions in the rescue and/or recovery and/or construction, renovation, alteration, demolition and all work performed at the premises, the Injured Plaintiff sustained (including, but not limited to) the following injuries:

	Cancer Injury: N/A.  Date of onset:  Date physician first connected this injury to  WTC work:		Cardiovascular Injury: Chest Pain Date of onset: 9/28/2007 Date physician first connected this injury to WTC work: To be supplied at a later date
<b>V</b>	Respiratory Injury: Cough; Shortness of  Breath Date of onset: 9/28/2007 Date physician first connected this injury to WTC work: To be supplied at a later date		Fear of Cancer Date of onset: 9/28/2007 Date physician first connected this injury to WTC work: To be supplied at a later date
	Digestive Injury: N/A.  Date of onset:  Date physician first connected this injury to WTC work:  NOTE: The foregoing is NOT an exhau	<b>V</b>	Other Injury: N/A.  Date of onset:  Date physician first connected this injury to WTC work:

2. As a direct and proximate result of the injuries identified in paragraph "1", above, the Ground Zero-Plaintiff has in the past suffered and/or will in the future suffer the following compensable damages:

Pain and suffering
Loss of the enjoyment of life
Loss of earnings and/or impairment of earning capacity
Loss of retirement benefits/diminution of retirement benefits  Expenses for medical care, treatment, and
Other:
<ul> <li>✓ Mental anguish</li> <li>✓ Disability</li> <li>✓ Medical monitoring</li> <li>✓ Other: Not yet determined</li> </ul>

3. As a direct and proximate result of the injuries described *supra*, the derivative plaintiff(s), if any, have in the past suffered and/or will in the future suffer a loss of the love, society, companionship, services, affection, and support of the plaintiff and such other losses, injuries and damages for which compensation is legally appropriate.

**WHEREFORE**, plaintiff(s) respectfully pray that the Court enter judgment in his/her/their favor and against defendant(s) for damages, costs of suit and such other, further and different relief as may be just and appropriate.

Plaintiff(s) demands that all issues of fact in this case be tried before a properly empanelled jury.

Dated: New York, New York November 7, 2007

Yours, etc.,

Worby, Groner Edelman & Napoli Bern, LLP

Attorneys for Plaintiff(s), Roland Roberts and Amelia

Roberts

By:

Christopher R. LoPalo (CL 6466)

115 Broadway

12<sup>th</sup> Floor

New York, New York 10006

Phone: (212) 267-3700

ATTORNEY VERIFICATION

CHRISTOPHER R. LOPALO, an attorney at law, duly admitted to practice in the Courts of the State of New York, affirms under the penalties of

perjury that:

He is the attorney for the plaintiff(s) in the above-entitled action.

That he has read the foregoing SUMMONS AND VERIFIED COMPLAINT and knows

the contents thereof, and upon information and belief, deponent believes

the matters alleged therein to be true.

The reason this Verification is made by deponent and not by the

plaintiff(s) is that the plaintiff(s) herein reside(s) in a county other

than the one in which the plaintiff's attorneys maintain their office.

The source of deponent's information and the grounds of his belief

are communication, papers, reports and investigation contained in the

file.

DATED: New York, New York

November 7, 2007

CHRISTOPHER R. LOPALO

ocket No: UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK	
ROLAND ROBERTS (AND WIFE, AMELIA ROBERTS),	===
Plaintiff(s) - against -	
A RUSSO WRECKING, ET. AL.,	
Defendant(s).	
SUMMONS AND VERIFIED COMPLAINT	===
WORBY GRONER EDELMAN & NAPOLI BERN, LLP  Attorneys for: Plaintiff(s)  Office and Post Office Address, Telephone  115 Broadway - 12th Floor  New York, New York 10006  (212) 267-3700	
To Attorney(s) for	
Service of a copy of the within is hereby admitted.	
Attorney(s) for	
PLEASE TAKE NOTICE:	===
□ NOTICE OF ENTRY  that the within is a (certified) true copy of an duly entered in the office of the clerk of the within named court on20  □ NOTICE OF SETTLEMENT  that an order of which the within is a true of will be presented for settlement to the HON. one of the within named Court, at on 20 at M.	
Dated, Yours, etc., WORBY GRONER EDELMAN & NAPOLI BERN, LLI	P